

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X  
In re:

Chapter 7

RAHUL DEV MANCHANDA,

Case No. 23-22095 (SHL)

Debtor.

-----X  
In re:

Chapter 7

MANCHANDA LAW OFFICE, PLLC,

Case No. 23-11805 (SHL)

Debtor.

-----X  
DOUGLAS M. SENDEROFF,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Adv. Pro. No. 23-07008 (SHL)

RAHUL DEV MANCHANDA,

Defendant.

-----X  
WILLIAM K. HARRINGTON, as United  
States Trustee for Region 2,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Adv. Pro. No. 24-07009 (SHL)

RAHUL DEV MANCHANDA,

Defendant.

-----X  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Adv. Pro. No. 24-07010 (SHL)

RAHUL DEV MANCHANDA,

Defendant.

-----X

**ORDER REGARDING FILINGS**

On May 12, 2025, the Court entered a *Memorandum and Order Denying Requests for Contempt and/or Sanctions and Enjoining Filings by Debtor* [ECF No. 238]<sup>1</sup> (the “Filing Injunction Order”). Among other things, the Filing Injunction Order denied certain contempt requests for alleged violations of the stay that were made by the above-captioned debtor/defendant Rahul Dev Manchanda (the “Debtor”).<sup>2</sup> Given the Debtor’s history of vexatious litigation, the Filing Injunction Order put in place certain procedural requirements for the Debtor to follow before the Court would grant the Debtor leave to assert any additional motions seeking contempt and/or sanctions (the “Procedural Requirements”). *See* Filing Injunction Order at 23-24. The Procedural Requirements are meant to provide the Court with sufficient information to determine whether the Debtor’s requests for contempt and/or sanctions have an appropriate basis in law or fact. *See id.* The Filing Injunction Order also disposed of certain of the Debtor’s then-existing contempt requests and denied others without prejudice to being reasserted by the Debtor upon his compliance with the Procedural Requirements.

Since issuance of the Court’s Filing Injunction Order, it appears that PayArc LLC (“PayArc”), the subject of one of the Debtor’s prior requests, has taken further steps with respect to the Debtor. *See Notice of Motion for Contempt of Court Against Payarc, Payment Cloud Inc, Lisette Barajas, Shawn Silver, Merlinkresponse.com, Tsys, Payjunction.com, Julio Loaiza, Roberto Swartz, Amguard Insurance, Eric Weissman, Keith Grunberg-Daniels, Sonia Chacon Anaya, NYS Department of Financial Services and Affirmation in Support of Motion for Contempt* [Case No. 23-22095, ECF No. 187; Case No. 23-11805, ECF No. 56] (the “PayArc Contempt Request”); *see also Notice of Impleader* [ECF No. 246] (request of the Debtor

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all Case Management/Electronic Case Filing (“ECF”) references are to Case No. 23-22095.

<sup>2</sup> The Debtor served as the principal of Manchanda Law Office, PLLC (the “Corporate Debtor” and, together with the Debtor, the “Debtors”).

addressed to District Court for the Southern District of New York, attaching letter from counsel to PayArc LLC relating to legal collection).

Payment Cloud, Inc. (“Payment Cloud”), one of the parties mentioned in Debtor’s PayArc Contempt Request, filed responsive papers indicating that PayArc is an independent sales organization that is not legal related to Payment Cloud. *See Payment Cloud, Inc., Lisette Barajas, and Shawn Silver’s Response to Motions for Contempt* at PDF Page 2 of 3 [ECF No. 225]. Payment Cloud further noted that the initial PayArc transaction at issue relating to the Debtor—and the subsequent dispute process—all arose post-petition and that the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362 does not prohibit actions or efforts with respect to claims that arose subsequent to the Debtors’ bankruptcy filings. *See id.* PayArc, however, did not directly file responsive papers. The Court takes no position at this time on whether the PayArc Contempt Request has a sound basis in law or fact. But to the extent that the Debtor wishes to reassert any request for relief as to PayArc, he is directed to comply with the Procedural Requirements as directed in the Filing Injunction Order and should also provide documentary information to address whether the claims asserted by PayArc arose prior to the date of the Debtors’ bankruptcy filings.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: White Plains, New York  
July 23, 2025

/s/ Sean H. Lane  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

**COPIES TO:**

**Via ECF and Email:**

Rahul Dev Manchanda  
270 Victory Blvd.  
New Rochelle, NY 10801  
rahul.manchanda.new.york@gmail.com  
*Chapter 7 Debtor*

**Via ECF and Email:**

Marianne T. O'Toole, Esq.  
2 Depot Plaza, Suite 2 E  
Bedford Hills, NY 10507  
trustee@otoolegroup.com  
*Chapter 7 Trustee*

**Via ECF and Email:**

Salvatore LaMonica, Esq.  
LaMonica Herbst & Maniscalco, LLP  
3305 Jerusalem Avenue  
Wantagh, NY 11793  
sl@lhmlawfirm.com  
*Chapter 7 Trustee*

**Via U.S. Mail and Email:**

Smith Carroad Wan & Parikh, P.C.  
202 East Main Street  
Smithtown, NY 11787  
info@smithcarroad.com  
*Counsel to PayArc*

**Via U.S. Mail and Email:**

Payarc  
Julio Loaiza  
Roberto Swartz  
Sonia Chacon Anaya  
411 W Putnam Avenue  
Ste 340  
Greenwich, CT 06830  
support@payarc.com

**Via U.S. Mail and Email:**

Heather A. DeGrave, Esq.  
Walters Levine & DeGrave  
601 Bayshore Blvd.  
Suite 720  
Tampa, FL 33606  
hdegrave@walterslevine.com  
*Counsel for Payment Cloud, Lisette Barajas and Shawn Silver*